

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

May 20, 2003

LB 622

that does not have a city sales tax then would be hurt because they would not be able to make it up by the broadening of the sales tax. Is that true or could you expound on that a little bit?

SENATOR RAIKES: No, I think that's true, Senator. The only thing I would mention is that to the extent the sales tax revenue enables cities to lower property tax rates over what they otherwise would be able to do, the net effect of that makes the MEF formula work more in the favor of cities that don't have sales tax.

SENATOR KREMER: A city sales tax.

SENATOR RAIKES: And that...and that MEF formula would still be in place and still be fully funded even with this amendment.

SENATOR KREMER: So they would not be impacted adversely then?

SENATOR RAIKES: Well, I can't tell you, Senator, that there would be no impact. There is potentially an impact I think it would certainly be mitigated...

SENATOR KREMER: Okay.

SENATOR RAIKES: ...by what would happen through the MEF formula.

SENATOR KREMER: Okay. Thank you. That's really all the questions I had, just wondering what would happen to the cities that do not have a city sales tax. So thank you, Mr. President.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Kremer. Senator Janssen, on AM1956.

SENATOR JANSSEN: Thank you, Senator Cudaback. Members of the Legislature, I, too, am going to rise in opposition to this amendment, not because I really want to. It's because of the fact that I can see what is going to happen to some of the smaller cities and villages in...not only in my district but across the state. They are up...they are up against a rock and